

IVI Specialty Vehicle Program Partnership: Strategic Meeting
Washington, DC (at TRB Annual Meeting)
January 13, 1999
9:45 – 11:00 a.m.

Attendance

Monica Kress	CA DOT	Wally McKeel	VA DOT
Gene McHale	FHWA	Ty Lasky	AHMCT
John Harding	FHWA	Farid Bigdeli	MITRE-Tech
Dave Gorg		Marthand Nookala	MN DOT
Greg Larson	CA DOT	Dennis Foderberg	MN DOT
John Kiljan	CO DOT	J R. Robinson	VA DOT
Bill Bushman	VA DOT	Max Donath	University of MN

Agenda Items:

- Scope of Work
- Formalization of the Partnership: Budget, Voting, Charter, Meetings
- Future Action Items: Membership Development, Project Development

Notes of Discussion

It was suggested to consider the inclusion of “friends of” partners – i.e., Minnesota police is limited on funds but Minnesota DOT would like to fund a project for them.

There was extensive discussion on how to further “announce” the Partnership to develop the membership list. AASHTO committees should be contacted, other groups with membership by research coordinators could be targeted (i.e. Enterprise and Aurora)

Specific suggestions listed:

I-95 corridor group (13 states VA – Maine – Priority Corridor Project = John Baneak)

Send letters to:

- AASHTO RAC (State DOT reps RAC advises SC’s
- Standing committee on research (SCOR) Regional reps
- Standing committee on highways
- States
- I-95
- Enterprise
- Aurora?

Utilize TRB’s Rodney Pletan as a contact?

It was suggested that some investigation into contacts for public safety specialty vehicles may be needed since they are not necessarily in our realm of contacts at ITS America or TRB

Discussion centered on the type of projects to be funded, also. Is it “research all the time?” How about operational tests? General consensus was that research could be emphasized, but field tests or demonstrations might not be excluded.

There ought to be some directive about how to manage/control the funds. Can partners keep their money in their own money for reimbursement? No. But still up for discussion.

It was agreed that the Partnership needs a Charter for states to be guided by.

Mitre Tech can help with development of charter (Farid Bjedeli)

John Kiljan has been on Enterprise and recalls their process of development – good source of information. He will send Monica the Enterprise Charter for a model strawman.

Put in Charter that contribution drives weighting of decision-making.

Some discussion of funding strategy occurred. Mostly a discussion between California and Minnesota as the current partners. Need money transfer between California and Minnesota DOT. Marthand put forth a theory of using 10% of pooled fund only in order to get Minnesota U working asap.

What about continued Federal support?

To leverage funds is the objective, how about giving some money to Minnesota DOT to finish snow plow, but they fund the majority with their money?

Suggestion to set a deadline date for participating in first year funds, such as requesting new partners to submit a letter of intent – by March 15th indicating the expected date for PR2.

Must allow for travel reimbursement and the limits and methods for approval.

Minnesota DOT offered to administer this, but it was declined by California representative Greg Larson. As the program's administrating manager, California will maintain lead role.

Can CT accept non-federal money from another state? John Kiljian (CO DOT) indicates it might be administration problem. General fund is where incoming money goes.

Action Item Review:

- Monica Kress (California): Contact Ken Kobetski to outreach to each state through AASHTO committees.
- Gene McHale (FHWA) / Farid Bigdeli: Utilize model charters to develop the Partnership Charter
- Marthand Nookala (Minnesota): Finalize strategy for funding contributions
- Other State DOT representatives: Consult respective authorities within their organizations for approval to participate in the Partnership and contribute to the Pooled Fund.